

Visibility

Pollution Prevention Publication

Maricopa County Environmental
Services Department

January– March 2001

NEW ENVIRONMENTAL MENTORING PROGRAM

The Arizona Association of Industries (AAI)/Maricopa County Joint Training Committee (JTC) kicked off their new mentoring program on October 26th at the Small Business Environmental Assistance Program (SBEAP) Regulatory Roundup. The Arizona ELM (Environmental Leadership through Mentoring) Program is a new program designed to help those members of industry who struggle with environmental issues. It is not intended to be a consulting service, but will instead “teach people how to fish” so they can help themselves. The program is a way to bring more industries into an active compliance mode through knowledge transfer and free assistance in a non-threatening atmosphere, with a focus on self-improvement and relationships.

ELM's vision is to establish a formal environmental mentoring program for all industry located in the State of Arizona. Phase I is to establish a formal air quality mentoring program for Maricopa County in 2001. Phase II will expand the air quality mentoring program to other counties within Arizona by 2002. The third and final phase will be to expand the mentoring program to include all environmental, health, and safety topics for the entire state by 2005.



ELM's mission is to provide environmental assistance to businesses in Arizona through periodic technical training sessions, networking opportunities, and a free formal one-on-one mentoring program. The one-on-one program will have a minimum of 10 businesses matched with mentors. There will be a program kick-off meeting with volunteer mentors and businesses, and there will be an annual mentor/business program survey.

The JTC will administrate the program by matching mentors to mentees, scheduling training, coordinating seminars, and evaluating program effectiveness. AAI will provide administrative assistance by providing a mailing address, a web site, and records and training packages.

ELM mentors must have a college degree and/or professional certification, 5-10 years experience in the environmental field, and demonstrated experience in performing site assessments. Mentors must also be willing to commit approximately two hours per month in volunteer time, attend 1-2 mentor training/networking sessions

per year, participate in the program for a minimum of 1 year, and complete an annual program evaluation and feedback form.

ELM mentees must have a business in Maricopa County and have a management commitment to supply the necessary resources for implementing environmental improvement projects. Mentees must be willing to commit approximately five hours per month to the program, attend the initial program orientation meeting, attend 1-2 mentee training/networking sessions per year, participate in the program for a minimum of 1 year, and complete an annual program evaluation and feedback form.

The ELM Program provides several advantages to businesses who participate. The program provides community service, a learning opportunity, improved relationships with suppliers and customers, an improved image for industry, and recognition for your company as an environmental leader.

Additional information will be presented at SBEAP's workshop on February 21st. Please see page 3 for more details. For more information on ELM, contact Patty Nelson at (602) 506-6709 or pnelson@mail.maricopa.gov.

Inside this issue:

Rule Process Changes	2
Success Story	2
EMS Experience	3
Mark Your Calendars	3
Ask The Expert	4
Performance Track	4
Pollution Prevention	5
Cool Websites	5
Brown Cloud Report	6
Dust Enforcement	6
Calendar	7
Reduce Waste	8
Contributors	8

MARICOPA COUNTY RULEMAKING PROCESS CHANGES

In 1962, the Arizona State Legislature passed enabling legislation authorizing County Boards of Supervisors to prevent and control air pollution in all its forms, either through the establishment of air pollution control districts or through the use of existing agencies.

In February 1963, the Maricopa County Board of Supervisors adopted a series of air pollution control regulations drawn-up by the Maricopa County Health Department. These regulations prohibited open burning, prohibited the use of incinerators other than multi-chamber ones, forbade the handling of various materials in such a way as to pollute the air, and required the control of contaminants from industries and construction work.

Over the decades, the responsibility for writing the rules regulating air pollution in Maricopa County has passed from the Maricopa County Health Department to the Maricopa County Department of Health Services, Division of Public Health, Bureau of Air Pollution Control, and finally to the Maricopa County Environmental Services Department, Division of Air Pollution Control. In addition, over the decades the number of Maricopa County air pollution control regulations has increased from ten (1963-1964), to 35 (1971), to 44 (1980-1984), and now to 60 with 5 appendices (2000).

Regardless of which department, bureau, or division is responsible for writing the rules regulating air pollution in Maricopa



County, the county's authority for adopting such rules has been and still is in Arizona Revised Statutes (ARS), Title 49 (The Environment), Chapter 3 (Air Quality).

NEW STATE LAW

In April 2000, Governor Hull signed Senate Bill 1480 into law, which added specific rulemaking procedures to ARS, Title 49, Chapters 1 (General Provisions) and 3. Consequently, beginning July 1, 2001, the Maricopa County Air Pollution Control Division (APCD) will have to make changes in its rulemaking process. These changes are listed below.

BEFORE ADOPTING A RULE:

- File a written statement with the Secretary of State for publication in the Arizona Administrative Register (AAR);
- Publish notice of the availability of a written statement in newspapers;
- Make the text of any proposed rule available to the public at the same time the written statement is filed with the Secretary of State;
- Provide an opportunity for public comment for at least 30 days after publication of the written statement

in the AAR; and

- Provide a Public Hearing, either at the request of the authorized Maricopa County officer, or if there is sufficient public interest.

BEFORE THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS APPROVES A RULE:

- File with the Secretary of State, for publication in the AAR, a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking that includes a preamble and the exact wording of the proposed rule.
- At the same time, send a Notice to each person who has requested notification of proposed rulemakings.
- May meet informally with any interested party for the purpose of discussing a proposed rulemaking.
- May solicit comments, suggested language, or other input on the proposed rule.
- May publish notice of informal meetings in the AAR.
- Give persons the opportunity to submit written comments on the proposed rule, with or without the opportunity to present them orally, for at least 30 days after publication of the Notice in the AAR.
- If a written request for an oral proceeding is submitted within 30 days after the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking is published, schedule an oral proceeding.
- Close the record on the proposed rulemaking (no earlier than 30 days after the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking is published).

(Continued on page 3)

SUCCESS STORY: DUE DILIGENCE PRECLUDES ENFORCEMENT ACTION



An inspection of furniture manufacturing operation Legends Furniture in August 2000 resulted in a request by our air quality compliance inspector for certain emissions information. The total amounts of volatile organic compounds (VOCs) and hazardous air pollutants (HAPs) that the facility emitted for each calendar month from January 1999 through July 2000 were requested.

In June 1999, Legends' lacquer supplier informed the manufacturer that it could reformulate the lacquer to accomplish the goal of reducing VOC emissions.

Legends ordered the reformulated lacquer and verified its VOC content via the corresponding Material Safety Data Sheets (MSDS). Subsequent to the inspector's request for the emission information, the furniture manufacturer discovered that the reformulated lacquer its supplier had sent contained a higher HAPs content than the previous lacquer formulation. The supplier had done this without telling Legends Furniture, even though it knew that the HAP was not a necessary ingredient in the lacquer formulation. Records show that once Legends took steps on its own to stop accepting the high HAP content lacquer and started using a non-HAPs formula it

requested its supplier provide, its HAPs emissions immediately dropped.

The Air Quality Compliance section of Maricopa County Environmental Services sent Legends Furniture a Compliance Status letter noting that there would be no enforcement action taken because of the due diligence exhibited by the company and the subsequent self disclosure to the regulator. It also noted that the deviations from permit conditions that led to the situation would, however, be special interest items on future inspections of the facility.

EMS CERTIFICATION: ONE COMPANY'S EXPERIENCE

So, you're thinking about trying for ISO 14001 certification! Having just gone through this exhaustive process at Sumitomo Sitix of Phoenix, let me give you some tips and insight into the issues we dealt with as my company progressed along the journey to a certified Environmental Management System (EMS).

First and foremost, don't let management dump this program on you. If your management sees the certification as another award that it would like to tack on to its marketing brochures and Web site, you are doomed to failure. Management commitment needs to go way beyond the dollars it takes to implement and maintain the systems. Management must be involved in managing the systems. The Environmental Representative will likely play a large role in facilitation, but when push comes to shove for activities that must be accomplished, it is management, NOT the environmental staff person, that sets the expectations and the accountabilities. If that type of



involvement is not present, the auditors will quickly determine that your EMS is a paper program. It will not pass.

At Sitix of Phoenix, the commitment was thorough and absolute, which was a major factor in our being certified on our initial audit.

Another key factor in our success was the use of a consultant who helped keep our efforts properly focused. This was no ordinary environmental consultant. We used a *certified* EMS Lead Auditor in a consulting role to give us regular guidance as we developed our Environmental Management System. Our success can be attributed to the fact that we put systems together that were workable for our facility. The auditor-consultant made sure that we left out nothing important and that we did not go off on a tangent. Without this regular expert guidance, we believe that we would have worked very hard, but would have missed the target on several of the

critical elements to an ISO 14001 auditor.

Lastly, you need to allow time for the new systems to become active. Not only do the systems need to be tried on the floor, with enough time to work out the bugs, but a certain amount of history needs to be established to document to the ISO auditors that you have a functional system. Although our work efforts were not constantly on ISO 14001 items, the time period from the initial assistance from our consultant to the final push to prepare for our audit was *one year*. Of course, that time could have been less if we had ignored the completion of our regulatory requirements and reporting, but is that really an option for any of us?

Good luck on your EMS efforts. It will be well worth your effort.

Bob Hepker CIH, CSP, CHMM
Director Environmental Health and Safety
Sumitomo Sitix of Phoenix
bhepker@ssp.sitix.com

MARK YOUR CALENDARS...



The Small Business Environmental Assistance Program (SBEAP) will host an "EMS Pros & Cons Roundup" seminar on Wednesday, February 21, 2001 from 9 am - noon at Paradise Valley Community College. There is no charge to attend.

This free seminar will cover ISO 14001 standards and general information on Environmental Management System (EMS) practices, as well as success stories and mentoring. An EMS is a systematic, dynamic program integrating environmental management with facility operations.

All interested parties are encouraged to attend, but you must register in advance as seating is limited.

Please call Maureen Lynch, Program Coordinator, at (602) 506-5150 for more information, or register online at http://www.maricopa.gov/sbeap/conf2_21/index.htm.

RULEMAKING (Continued from page 2)

- Submit the adopted rule and a concise explanatory statement to the Board of Supervisors within 120 days after the close of the record on the proposed rulemaking.

MAINTAIN AN OFFICIAL RULEMAKING RECORD CONTAINING:

- Copies of all publications in the AAR in conjunction with the rule;
- All written comments received in conjunction with the rule;
- Any official transcript or oral presentations made in the rule proceeding, any tape recording or stenographic record of those presentations, and any summary of

the contents of those presentations;

- A copy of any materials submitted to the Board of Supervisors; and
- A copy of the final rule approved by the Board of Supervisors, the preamble, the concise explanatory statement, and the response to comments.

PUBLISH AN ANNUAL DIRECTORY:

- Summarize the subject matter of all currently applicable rules and of all substantive policy statements pertaining to ARS, Title 49, Chapter 3, Article 3 (County Air Pollution Control) in the AAR;
- Keep copies of these directories and substantive policy statements in one

location;

- The directories, rules, substantive policy statements, and any material incorporated by reference in the directories, rules, or substantive policy statements must be open to public inspection at the APCD offices;
- On or before June 30 of each year, the APCD will have to certify to the Board of Supervisors that it has the summaries.

Stay tuned for more developments on how the Air Pollution Control Division will implement these new procedures.

ASK THE ENVIRONMENTAL EXPERT



Have you ever had an environmental question but weren't sure where to find the answer? We can help! Send your questions to dromesbu@mail.maricopa.gov.

Ed Lange asked:

"My understanding is that a permit is only required if dirt is to be disturbed and vacant lots do not require one. An existing dirt road, driveway or parking lot greater than 0.1 acre with traffic would generate particulates, but no permit is required. Is this an oversight?"

Thank you for your question, Ed: Did Maricopa County mistakenly omit requiring a permit for existing dirt roads,

driveways, and parking lots from the fugitive dust rules?

Maricopa County does not require a permit for existing dirt roads, driveways, and parking lots, provided such existing dirt roads, driveways, and parking lots are not part of a construction project that is required to have a permit under Rule 310 (Fugitive Dust Sources). Maricopa County lacks the resources to issue permits and conduct routine inspections of all existing dirt roads, driveways, and parking lots located within Maricopa County's more than 9,000 square miles.

So, for now, the best that Maricopa County can do is require that specific dust control measures be implemented on existing dirt roads, driveways, and

parking lots under Rule 310.01 (Fugitive Dust From Open Areas, Vacant Lots, Unpaved Parking Lots, And Unpaved Roadways) and proactively enforce Maricopa County's fugitive dust rules. To that end, Maricopa County has established an Environmental Response telephone line. To confidentially report dust violations or other environmental complaints, citizens in Maricopa County can call (602) 506-6616.

Thanks again, Ed, for your question.

Johanna M. Kuspert
Air Quality Division
Planning & Analysis Unit
(602) 506-6710

EPA SELECTS CHARTER MEMBERS OF PERFORMANCE TRACK PROGRAM

U. S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Administrator Carol M. Browner recently congratulated 225 businesses and facilities for their selection as charter members in the National Environmental Achievement Track. The program recognizes and rewards businesses for exceeding environmental protection requirements.

"A new era of environmental protection has been launched over the last decade by growing numbers of American businesses," said Browner. "These businesses recognize that environmental protection can go hand in hand with economic growth. We are especially appreciative of those companies willing to do more than is required by law to protect public health and insure greater protection of our air, water and land."

Achievement Track companies and facilities have strong records in environmental management, with more waste recycling and greater reductions in air and water pollution than are legally required. They have reduced their energy consumption by millions of kilowatts per year, and are committing to an average of 22 percent improved energy efficiency in the future. Commitments for future water use reductions average 31 percent. Some companies have even succeeded in virtually eliminating discharges to surface water, while others are significantly reducing discharges to groundwater to protect underground



**National
Environmental
Performance Track**

drinking water supplies. Waste reduction at these facilities is projected to average 44 percent per year, representing millions of pounds of saved resources as process and packaging materials are recycled or reused. Others are significantly reducing emissions of greenhouse gases to help protect the ozone layer, and some will cut their output of toxic air pollutants in half.

Based on several state leadership programs and numerous EPA innovation efforts with states, businesses, and community and environmental groups, EPA has learned that innovations in environmental management can be used to create strategic business opportunities and advantages while maximizing the health and productivity of ecosystems and communities.

The expectation is that the program will motivate other companies and facilities to achieve similar improvements and complement existing regulatory activities. The program has been designed so that criteria for participation are proportional to the benefits and that small, medium and large facilities will participate. Emphasis is being placed on continued environmental improvement, effective state/EPA partnerships, and the need to

inform and involve citizens and communities.

The roster of companies in the program includes small businesses and large corporations representing the automotive, pharmaceutical, sports equipment, food processing, chemical, and petroleum industries, to name a few.

The facilities and corporate headquarters are located in 38 states and Puerto Rico.

Among the 225 charter members are municipalities and branches of the federal government.

The National Environmental Achievement Track is the first level of the new National Environmental Performance Track program. EPA plans to launch the second level of the program, the Stewardship Track, in May 2001. The National Environmental Performance Track program was established by EPA to recognize and encourage top environmental performers - those businesses that go beyond compliance with regulatory requirements.

Further information on the National Environmental Performance Track and the process for being recognized for similar achievements is available at <http://www.epa.gov/performance-track/>.

POLLUTION PREVENTION: EXTENDED PRODUCT RESPONSIBILITY (EPR)



Traditional approaches to pollution prevention have focused largely on reducing pollution when a product is being produced – during the process of making a product. Since the early 1970's, the Polluter Pays Principle, codified by the Organization for Economic Co-Operation and Development, has been the guiding principle for pollution control policies and production-facility-oriented pollution prevention policies. The basic idea behind the Polluter Pays Principle is to internalize external costs of pollution by requiring the polluter to pay in some manner for the costs of the pollution. The principle states that the polluter should bear the expenses of preventing and controlling pollution to ensure that the environment is in an acceptable state, irrespective of whether these costs are incurred through some charge on pollutant emissions or are in response to some direct regulation leading to an enforced reduction in pollution.

WHO IS RESPONSIBLE?

The Polluter Pays Principle, however, is more focused on pollution at the facility level and is not adequate to deal with situations in which a useful product becomes pollution itself at a later stage of the life cycle. For example, the producer of disposable packaging may effectively reduce solid waste generation in its own production process, but the packaging is thrown in a landfill by the purchaser. Who is the polluter, the producer of the packaging or the purchaser who threw it in the landfill?

The producer of a laundry detergent may effectively reduce toxic chemical releases from its own production process, but the surfactants used in the detergent are frequently made from carcinogenic chemicals that are released into the environment during their production. Who is the polluter, the producer of the laundry detergent or the producer of the surfactant?

The manufacturer of a refrigerator may effectively reduce energy use and waste generation in its own production process, but after the refrigerator is purchased, the energy used by the refrigerator creates far more significant environmental impacts. Who is the polluter, the

manufacturer or the purchaser who demands energy by using it?

Although the Polluter Pays Principle has helped in promoting pollution prevention, it has focused exclusively on the emissions from the production process, or "end-of-the-pipe" pollution prevention. The rising costs of controlling pollution at the end of the pipe, as well as the costs of cleaning up past pollution, have encouraged manufacturers to select a more economical strategy of preventing pollution in their own facilities.

A NEW APPROACH

This new strategy is called Extended Product Responsibility (EPR). Under EPR, all participants in the product's life – designers, suppliers, manufacturers, distributors, users and disposers – are responsible for pollution prevention and resource conservation. The greater the ability of the actor to influence the life-cycle impacts of the product system, the greater the degree of responsibility for addressing those impacts. EPR can be applied by industry voluntarily or by government as a regulatory requirement.

A variety of tools can be used to implement EPR. Some businesses in the United States are already implementing EPR for a variety of reasons. Some are responding to mandates abroad. Some are striving to meet corporate goals to "green" their products. Some recognize that products can be valuable assets even at the end of their useful life.

SOME EXAMPLES:

- DuPont has partnered with its customers to develop reverse distribution systems to recover postindustrial (and eventually post-consumer) plastic film waste, which it reprocesses into feedstock used to remanufacture new plastic.
- Rochester-Midland, a manufacturer of institutional cleaning products, is involving cleaning service providers, building owners, and tenants in the design and implementation of mitigation strategies to improve the indoor environment of office buildings. Customer feedback is the foundation for both product reformulation and the development of new customer services, such as education and joint problem solving.
- Georgia-Pacific is working with

waste managers and processors of waste to collect, sort, and process wood product discards into new products.

- S.C. Johnson Wax and other aerosol manufacturers, in partnership with suppliers and waste processors, are educating waste management officials and consumers on the benefits of recycling aerosol cans in order to recover the steel.

BENEFITS OF EPR:

- Increased customer satisfaction and loyalty.
- Maintain or improve competitive advantage.
- Increased efficiency of resource use.
- Save money and/or increase profits.
- Respond to actual or threatened regulatory requirements in the U.S. and abroad.
- Advance a company's own goals for sustainability.

(Continued on page 6)

COOL WEBSITES



If you know of a website our readers might like to see, send it to dromesbu@mail.maricopa.gov.

- ☆ The ISO 14000 Information Center is at <http://www.iso14000.com/>.
- ☆ The ISO Support Group is at <http://www.isogroup.simplenet.com/>.
- ☆ ISO 14000 and Environmental Management Systems: A Foundation for Sustainability at <http://www.trst.com/index.htm> encourages organizations to implement environmental management systems.
- ☆ EPA has launched the National Compliance Assistance Clearinghouse at <http://www.epa.gov/clearinghouse> to provide regulated industries with essential compliance assistance information.
- ☆ The Performance Institute at <http://www.performanceweb.org> is a resource for public, private and non-profit organizations seeking to improve their performance through best practice analysis, strategic management and performance measurement.

BROWN CLOUD SUMMIT REPORT



On March 15, 2000, Governor Hull signed Executive Order 2000-3 that established the Governor's Brown Cloud Summit to identify and examine strategies to improve visibility in the Valley of the Sun. The members include industry leaders, government representatives, and members of various health organizations.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Some of the control measures being considered are:

- Mandatory adoption of California Air Resources Board diesel fuel;
- Voluntary replacement of airport ground support equipment;
- Mandatory nitrogen oxide (NOX) reduction systems;
- A voluntary clean equipment and fuels program with state contract incentives;
- A voluntary visibility trading program;
- A voluntary vehicle retrofit and repair

program for light duty gasoline vehicles;

- A voluntary repair and retrofit program for diesel trucks;
- Full implementation of roadside testing for diesel trucks;
- Diesel truck idling restrictions;
- Truck bypass and speed restrictions on poor visibility days;
- Voluntary early implementation of ultra-low sulfur diesel fuel for use in public fleet diesel vehicles retrofitted with oxidation catalysts and particulate filters;
- Banning leaf blowers;
- Funding for more efficient street sweepers;
- Replacing generators with electric power at construction sites;
- Dust control training for all contractors;
- Expansion of "Area A";
- Controls for stationary reciprocating internal combustion engines; and
- A new type of visibility standard based upon "Blue Sky" targets. Days

with one or more 6-hour periods with visibility greater than 25 miles would be "Blue Sky" days. The amount of Blue Sky days targeted for 2001 will be 250 days, with 260 days targeted for 2002 and 275 days targeted for 2003. To implement this standard, the existing monitoring network will be expanded upon and an assessment of visibility trends, success of control strategies, and causes of specific problems will be analyzed on a periodic basis.

FOR MORE INFORMATION

The draft report was approved by the Summit on December 12th, 2000. Before submitting a final report to Governor Hull, Summit members are seeking public comment on their recommendations. Between December 13 and January 7, you can learn about the ideas being proposed and submit your comments online at <http://www.adeq.state.az.us/envIRON/air/browncloud/index.html>.

DUST ENFORCEMENT PROGRAM

On April 28, 2000, Maricopa County implemented a new enforcement policy for violations of county dust control requirements. The Dust Control Enforcement Program is a partnership between the Maricopa County Attorney's Office and the Environmental Services Department.

The PM10 Emissions Inventory identified 43% of Maricopa County's dust problem as being caused by construction activities. Almost 33% of the problem is from roads, and approximately 23% is from vacant and agricultural land.

Eight Environmental Services dust inspectors respond to complaints and

perform routine inspections. Compliance status notifications are issued for deficiencies and Notices of Violation are issued for the twelve most critical violations, which are then referred to the Community Action Bureau of the County Attorney's Office for prosecution.

Once a case has been submitted to the Bureau, an attorney reviews it and schedules a settlement conference. If an agreement cannot be reached, the attorney may then file a civil or criminal case. The attorney determines how to proceed based on the nature of the violation, the violator's history and willingness to comply, and the severity of the dust problem.

As of November 30, 2000, 67 cases have been settled and approximately \$250,000 has been collected in penalties.



The construction industry has been very cooperative in dealing with this issue. Two seminars were sponsored by industry associations, six companies have requested and received on-site training from the Environmental Services Department, and several on-site consultations have been performed at the request of industry.

PRODUCTS *(Continued from page 5)*

BARRIERS TO EPR:

- Lack of understanding of the concept.
- Regulatory obstacles.
- Insufficient analytical tools.
- Customer acceptance.
- Technological barriers.
- "Free riders" in voluntary systems.
- Underutilized and insufficient

infrastructure for handling, reusing, and reprocessing waste with potential market value.

- Organizational barriers that create inertia.

While there will likely be continued pros and cons of EPR, the principle captures the essence of pollution control and the broad vision of pollution prevention.

SOURCES:

- ♦ "Is There A Broad Principle Of EPR?", Gary Davis, Center For Clean Products And Clean Technologies (<http://eerc.ra.utk.edu/clean/>), University Of Tennessee, 1998.
- ♦ "Sustainable America", President's Council on Sustainable Development (<http://www.whitehouse.gov/PCSD/index.html>), Washington, D.C., 1995.


January 2001

Sun	Mon	Tue	Wed	Thu	Fri	Sat
	1 	2	3	4	5	6
7	8	9	10	11	12	13
14	15	16	17	18	19	20
21	22	23	24	25	26	27
28	29	30	31			

February 2001

Sun	Mon	Tue	Wed	Thu	Fri	Sat
				1 W	2	3
4	5	6	7 H	8	9	10
11	12	13	14 	15 W	16	17
18	19	20	21 S	22	23	24
25	26	27	28			

March 2001

Sun	Mon	Tue	Wed	Thu	Fri	Sat
				1 W	2	3
4	5	6	7 H	8	9	10
11	12	13	14	15 W	16	17 
18	19	20	21	22	23	24
25	26	27	28	29	30	31

AIR RULE WORKSHOPS AND HEARINGS

Public workshops are held at 1001 N. Central Ave., Suite 560. Public hearings are held at the Board of Supervisors' Auditorium, 205 W. Jefferson St. and are tentative until set by the Board. Draft copies of rules are available at the Air Quality Division, 1001 N. Central Ave., Suite 201. For updates, call (602) 506-0169. This schedule, current Air Quality Rules, and proposed draft rules are available at <http://www.maricopa.gov/envsvc/air/workshops.asp>.

January 1st: Rule Compliance Deadline

Per Rule 331 (Solvent Cleaning), subsection 308.3, any low viscosity solvents used to clean an aerospace component if the Federal Aviation Authority, US Department of Defense or a US Military specification designates that the cleanliness of the component is critical to the flight safety of a complete aerospace vehicle shall be listed in an MCESD air pollution permit, conditioned upon a sufficient demonstration by the user that no compliant substitute exists.

W = Workshop H = Hearing S = Seminar

February 1st at 9 am:

Public Workshop on New Rules 322 (Power Plant Operations) and 323 (Industrial-Institutional-Commercial Steam Generating Units, Boilers and Process Heaters)

February 7th at 9 am:

Public Hearing on Rules 210 (Title V Permit Provisions), 240 (Permits for New Major Sources & Major Modifications to Existing Major Sources), and 300 (Visible Emissions)

February 15th at 1:30 pm:

Public Workshop on New Rule 358 (Foam Expansion)

February 21st from 9 am to noon:

SBEAP seminar, "EMS Pros & Cons Roundup". See page 3 for details.

March 1st at 9:00 am:

Public Workshop on Rule 280 (Fees)

March 1st at 1:30 pm:

Public Workshop on Rules 350 (Bulk Storage of Gasoline & Organic Liquids) and 351 (Organic Liquid Transfer To & From Bulk Tanks)

March 7th at 9 am:

Public Hearing on Rules 100 (General Provisions & Definitions), 321 (Municipal Solid Waste Landfills), 360 (New Source Performance Standards), 370 (Federal Hazardous Air Pollutant Program), and 371 (Acid Rain)

March 15th at 9 am:

Public Workshop on Rules 200 (Permit Requirements) and 324 (Stationary Internal Combustion Engines)

Visibility Pollution Prevention Publication

Maricopa County Environmental
Services Department

1001 N. Central Ave., Suite 695
Phoenix, Arizona 85004
Phone: 602-506-6794
Fax: 602-506-6179
Email: dromesbu@mail.maricopa.gov



What Do You Want To See In Visibility in 2001?
Email your ideas to dromesbu@mail.maricopa.gov



REDUCE WASTE

We have a great idea to help you reduce waste and pollution - read *Visibility* on the internet! Not only will you save paper and mailing labels, but you'll also be able to see *Visibility* before anyone else. Every issue is available on the Internet at <http://www.maricopa.gov/sbeap>.

[maricopa.gov/sbeap](http://www.maricopa.gov/sbeap). You can also receive notification when each new issue is available via e-mail. Just send your name, company name, phone number, and e-mail address to Dee Romesburg at dromesbu@mail.maricopa.gov or call (602) 506-6794.

THE VISIBILITY NEWSLETTER

is published quarterly by the Pollution Prevention Committee of the Maricopa County Environmental Services Department (MCESD). Questions and requests to be added to the mailing list or email notification list may be addressed to Dee Romesburg at 1001 N. Central Ave., Suite 695, Phoenix, AZ 85004, by phone at (602) 506-6794, or by email at dromesbu@mail.maricopa.gov.

Dee Romesburg, Editor

CONTRIBUTORS

Jo Crumbaker; George Greenly; Rick Kramer-Howe; Johanna Kuspert; Maureen Lynch; Patty Nelson; and Richard Polito.